

SECRET

15 April 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. George Allen
Director, Imagery Analysis Service

SUBJECT : Office/Staff Responses to the
Deputy Director for Intelligence
re Watergate-Agency File Review

1. This memorandum establishes guidelines for the written certifications which are to be submitted to the Deputy Director for Intelligence in reporting the results of the Watergate-Agency File Review.

2. The certifications should specify that the reporting officer has polled each individual under his supervision regarding any contacts with individuals known or suspected to be involved in "Watergate" as well as any information each individual has or suspects regarding the misuse of intelligence resources in the context of Watergate. In addition, the certification should attest that all files under the reporting officer's control have been reviewed for any evidence pertaining to Watergate-associated activities.

3. These reports are to be submitted by Division Chiefs or other component chiefs to the appropriate Office Director or Staff Chief; they, in turn, will submit their reports to the Deputy Director for Intelligence. Because the report from any one component is likely to be at some variance with other submissions, no "standard, fill-in-the-blanks" memorandum would be appropriate. There are, however, items which should be covered in each submission, as follows:

SECRET

Working Paper —
Destroy After
2000 AM 1984

SECRET

SUBJECT: Office/Staff Responses to the Deputy Director
for Intelligence re Watergate-Agency File Review

--A statement regarding the time frame of the review; i.e., 20 January 1969 to the present (or cutoff at 31 March 1974).

--The personnel survey statement should cover all employees currently on board; should contain a listing of current employees not covered by the survey and reason(s) why; and should have an attachment containing individual "positive" statements, if any. If attempts are made to contact ex-employees, either as a result of memory-tickling of currently-on-board personnel or because of possibilities turned up in the file review, this should be indicated, as well as the results of such contacts or attempts. Conversely, if no attempt is made to contact ex-employees, this should be indicated (reason being that nothing turned up which warranted such contact).

--Unless there is evidence to the contrary, "positive" statements should not be interpreted as evidence of impropriety on the part of the reporting individual, but rather as an effort to make all contacts with Watergate figures a matter of record.

--The file review statement should indicate that all files were considered for review, and that appropriate files were physically searched (no listing necessary). Forward "positive" findings as an attachment, or report the result of the review as negative.

4. Those items which were previously reported in the May 1973 running of this exercise need not be resubmitted. Your report should, however, list in an attachment these previous submissions so that I can confirm their having been forwarded to the Inspector General as part of the DDI's responses to the IG last year.



25X1

SECRET